



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/767,847

01/30/2004

Peter Williamson

003797.00737

4097

28319

7590

10/19/2006

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NOS. 003797 & 013797
1001 G STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

VAUGHN, GREGORY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/767,847

Applicant(s)

WILLIAMSON ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory J. Vaughn

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,13-15,17,19-21,24-27 and 34-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,13-15,17,19-21,24-27 and 34-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Action Background

1. This action is responsive to the applicant's amendment, filed on 7/28/2006.
2. Applicant has canceled claims 2, 4, 7, 18, 22, 23 and 28; amended claims 1, 14, 17, 21, 24, 25 and 27; and added new claims 35-39. Claims 3, 5, 6, 8-12, 16 and 29-33 were previously canceled.
3. Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19, 20, 21, 24-27 and 34-39 are pending in the case, claims 1, 14 and 27 are independent claims.
4. Applicant has amended the specification and drawings in response to the objections cited by the examiner in the *Drawings* and *Specification* sections of the previous office action (dated 5/19/2006). Applicant's amendment has addressed the objections previously made, and therefore, in view of the amendment, objections to the drawings and specification are withdrawn.
5. Examiner's rejection of claims 2, 4, 18, 22, 23 and 28, made under 35 USC 101 in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101* section of the previous office action (dated 5/19/2006) is withdrawn in view of the cancelled claims.
6. Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 13-15, 17, 21, 24-25, 28 and 34, made under 35 USC 101 in the *Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101* section of the previous office action (dated 5/19/2006) is withdrawn in view of the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

8. Claims 1, 13-15, 17, 19, 20, 24-27 and 34 remain rejected and claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hawkins et al. US Patent 6,493,464, filed 9/8/1997, patented 12/10/2002 (hereinafter Hawkins).

9. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Hawkins discloses a computerized method of receiving user input identifying a symbol, a text expansion and a program, associating the text expansion and the program with the symbol, determining whether the handwritten user input represents a symbol. Hawkins recites: *"the computer system could be programmed to allow a user to define new input strokes, and/or to associate symbols, characters, or even complete words or phrases, to a combination of input strokes. Thus, a user-maintained glossary could be built where the user could define the sequences of characters--or symbols, text, or program functions--to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination, or sequence of multiple stroke combinations"* (column 12, lines 2-11).

Hawkins discloses determining a context in which the handwritten user input is written. Hawkins recites: *"the user could also define new strokes within a table (or other data structure) and assign context to each such stroke"* (column 12, lines 11-13).

Hawkins discloses the symbol to be text expansion and program. Hawkins discloses text expansion in figure 9, where the user input of "h" is expanded to "sh". Hawkins discloses programs associated to a shorthand type. Hawkins recites: *"a user-maintained glossary could be built where the user could define the sequences of characters--or symbols, text, or program functions--to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination, or sequence of multiple stroke combinations"* (column 12, lines 6-11).

Hawkins discloses applying the expansion associated with the symbol in Figure 9, where in response to the user writing "h", the display shows "sh".

Hawkins discloses displaying expanded text, implementing a function or launching a program dependent upon the symbol. Hawkins recites: *"a user-maintained glossary could be built where the user could define the sequences of characters--or symbols, text, or program functions--to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination, or sequence of multiple stroke combinations"* (column 12, lines 6-11).

10. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, Hawkins discloses the invention as computer readable medium. Hawkins recites: *"The computer program is stored on a storage media or device readable by a computer, and configures and operates the computer when the storage media or device is read by the*

computer, the computer being operated to determine, recognize, classify, and sometimes display handwritten strokes" (column 7, lines 5-10).

11. **Regarding independent claim 14**, Hawkins discloses receiving a handwritten user input including a first and a second input, and determining if the first input is associated with the second input. Hawkins recites: "*The present invention defines three different categories of pen strokes: (1) pre-character modifier strokes, (2) character or symbol strokes, and (3) post-character modifier strokes*" (column 4, lines 61-64). If the system described by Hawkins receives a first user input (either a pre-character modifier or a character/symbol stroke) and then a second user input (either a character/symbol stroke or a post character modifier stroke), then the system would determine the association between the user input strokes. Under certain conditions the strokes would be determined to be associated (i.e. if the first input is a pre-character modifier and the second is a character/symbol, or if the first input is a character/symbol and the second input is a post-character modifier). Under certain conditions the strokes would be determined to not be associated (i.e. when the strokes are both character/symbols).

Hawkins discloses second determining whether the first handwritten user input represents a shorthand entry if the first handwritten user input is not associated with the second handwritten user input, and applying the text expansion associated with the first input. As described in the previous paragraph, under certain conditions the strokes would be determined to not be associated (i.e. when the strokes are both character/symbols). In this case

the character/symbol input would be interpreted independent of the other input. If the input were a symbol, then the system would determine the *"characters--or symbols, text, or program functions--to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination, or sequence of multiple stroke combinations"* (column 12, lines 2-11).

12. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, Hawkins discloses the first handwritten user input as a single word. Hawkins recites: *"the computer system could be programmed to allow a user to define new input strokes, and/or to associate symbols, characters, or even complete words or phrases, to a combination of input strokes"* (column 12, lines 3-6).

13. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, Hawkins discloses comparing the first handwritten user input with a predetermined set of symbols and determining the text expansion. Hawkins recites: *"the computer system could be programmed to allow a user to define new input strokes, and/or to associate symbols, characters, or even complete words or phrases, to a combination of input strokes. Thus, a user-maintained glossary could be built where the user could define the sequences of characters--or symbols, text, or program functions--to be associated with a stroke, a multi-stroke combination, or sequence of multiple stroke combinations"* (column 12, lines 2-11).

14. **Regarding dependent claims 19 and 20**, Hawkins discloses simultaneously displaying the first and second handwritten user inputs in

Art Unit: 2178

Figure 7B, where a first input is a character, and the second input is the character accent.

15. **Regarding dependent claims 24 and 25**, Hawkins discloses determining the user input in response to the user input having stopped, or waiting a fixed period of time. Hawkins recites: *"In the past, recognition systems have solved this ambiguity by waiting until the user stopped writing, or by having a fixed delay period, after which characters were recognized"* (column 3, lines 17-20).
16. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, Hawkins discloses the invention as computer readable medium. Hawkins recites: *"The computer program is stored on a storage media or device readable by a computer, and configures and operates the computer when the storage media or device is read by the computer, the computer being operated to determine, recognize, classify, and sometimes display handwritten strokes"* (column 7, lines 5-10).
17. **Regarding independent claim 27**, the claim is substantially the same as claims 1, and is rejected using the same rationale.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 34**, Hawkins discloses the invention as computer readable medium. Hawkins recites: *"The computer program is stored on a storage media or device readable by a computer, and configures and operates the computer when the storage media or device is read by the computer, the computer being operated to determine, recognize, classify, and sometimes display handwritten strokes"* (column 7, lines 5-10).

Art Unit: 2178

19. **Regarding dependent claims 35 and 36**, Hawkins discloses receiving user input identifying the text expansion and the program prior to receiving the first user handwritten input, as described above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claim 21 remains rejected and claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins.

22. **Regarding dependent claims 21 and 37-39**, Hawkins discloses receiving handwritten user input, a first and second determining step, and applying an extension. Hawkins fails to disclose determining whether a total handwritten user input word count is equal to one, and if so then determining that the first handwritten user input is not associated with any other handwritten user input. However, Hawkins teaches the determining of associations of first and second user inputs as described above. Hawkins further teaches various user inputs that would allow a determination to be made as to whether the word

count was equal to one. For instance, Hawkins' Figure 5A shows typical end of word indicators, including "space" and "CRLF" symbols that would indicate that a complete word had been entered. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use a non-printing character symbol to indicate the user had entered a complete word in order to allow the system to be used for word processing functions.

Response to Arguments

23. Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
24. Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that "*Hawkins fails to teach associating both a text expansion and a program with the same symbol*" (page 13, last paragraph, of the response filed 7/28/2006) and "*Nor does Hawkins teach or suggest choosing between either the text expansion or the program depending upon the context*" (page 14, first paragraph of the response filed 7/28/2006). Applicant is directed to the rejection of claim 1 as stated above. Hawkins discloses the same symbol being associated with more than one meaning. See for instance Figures 4A and 4B where the symbol for "l" and "1" are the same symbol (a downward stroke). Although Hawkins' examples are directed toward the symbols representing text, Hawkins clearly indicates that the symbol can be for text or program

Art Unit: 2178

functions. Furthermore, Hawkins discloses the use of context for symbol determination, as described above.

Conclusion

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Vaughn whose telephone number is (571) 272-4131. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached at (571) 272-4124.

Art Unit: 2178

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory J. Vaughn
Patent Examiner
October 13, 2006



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER